


CA24N
MA 56
-67M35

THE MICROS & MACROS OF OUR URBAN CRISIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115475485>

CASΦN
MA 56
-71 M35

the transcription of a discussion organized by
the municipal research branch
— Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs —

14 April 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- PART I "Environmental Innovations In
Europe And Some Implications"
by Professor V. Chanasyk
Professor & Director
University of Guelph
- PART II "The Process Of New City Planning
And Building"
by Professor L. O. Gertler
Director, School of Urban and
Regional Planning
University of Waterloo
- PART III DIALOGUE
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

* * *



MACROS --- MICROS: A DIALOGUE - SEMINAR, TORONTO, APRIL 14/71

THE TWO LEAD PAPERS GIVEN IN TORONTO, APRIL 14TH. 1971.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROGRAM OF THE DIALOGUE SEMINAR, PLEASE CONTACT THE FOLLOWING:

Professor V. Chanasyk
Professor & Director
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario
Tel: A/c 519/824-4120

Professor L. O. Gertler
Director,
School of Urban & Regional Planning
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario
Tel: A/C519/744-6111

Mr. Nigel Richardson
Director
Haldimond Norfolk Study
Department of Municipal Affairs
801 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
Tel: 365-6504

Mr. J. O. Pearson
Co-Ordinator of Programs
Department of Municipal Affairs
801 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
Tel: 365-7065

Mr. K. D. Cameron, Research Officer
Department of Municipal Affairs
Tel: 365-6935

ENVIRONMENTAL INNOVATIONS IN EUROPE AND SOME IMPLICATIONS
FOR CANADA

Professor V. Chanasyk, Professor & Director,
University of Guelph

John Pearson may have his own particular reason as to why he feels I should talk to you. I am sure he believes that it is because I learned a few things in Europe and that I might tell you about them for our mutual benefit. He may be quite right in his assumption but chances are that you have been to Europe as well and can tell me many things I did not see or learn.

The real reason I am here is because I am muddled. As a matter of fact, I am very muddled and frustrated. And when one reaches such a state he goes to see a doctor. So here we are - I am the embodiment of a patient who is not at all well and you have unwittingly become my psychiatrist!

Here is the substance of my problem.

There are several things of which I am very sure:

People like green fields and flowers.

People like trees and forests.

People like water.

People like blue sky.

And people like people - up to a point.

These statements, you will notice, are at once symbolic, as well as direct in meaning.

There are several other things of which I am equally sure;

People do not like ugliness.

They do not like smog.

Neither do they like traffic jams and noise.

They do not like filthy water.

And they do not like faceless cages for living or working. Thus far I have been playing the old game of motherhood with you. But what I am really trying to do is to put in context my later discussion so as I go along I shall become more explicit. I would really like to go into more detail but because of time constraints you will understand why I am speaking in simplistic terms.

There are two major kinds of environment which represent existing problem areas or potential problem areas: These are, of course, the urban and the rural.

In the first case there is at least one new high-density residential development in Toronto the size of a town but which --

does not possess recreational space or amenity,
it does not possess community facilities,
it does not possess social or medical services,
it does not possess shopping facilities, and,
it does not possess transportation links to the city transit system.

There is evidence that people in Siberia are better accommodated.

Let us take the second case, that of the rural area about to become heavily urbanized. This area may be a rich agricultural region innocent as a virgin without family planning knowledge but looking forward very much to the bounties which marriage with industry should bring to her; or it may be a primary resource area in our northern hinterland designated for development.

There are gradations and other varieties of problem areas I have not discussed but of which you are well aware.

Here is the nub of the frustration which I feel as a designer of land - or as a citizen who feels we are short-changing ourselves.

Despite several generations of planning and what we like to describe generously as the application of sophisticated planning knowledge, the state of our physical and social environment does not in fact show evidence of successful fruition of planning action.

The manifestation of this void is debilitation and inadequacy of old and new city areas; continued urban sprawl; inadequate movement systems; irreversible pre-emption of prime agricultural, recreational and biological lands; sensory and physical pollution; poorly planned and designed highways; fragmented recreational planning; and so on.

There is skimpy on-site evidence to the professional - let alone to the layman, that planning has solved any of our major environmental problems.

Anxiety on my part in respect to this problem was compounded - paradoxically, by the highly laudable move on the part of the Government of Ontario towards, in the first place, regionalization and, secondly, the Design for Development statements of our Prime Minister and the Ontario Government Plan for the Toronto-centered region.

While the principles, objectives and criteria presented in these statements could not be challenged, there was question in my mind as to whether these progressive steps might not yet become another hollow planning exercise unless governments, the professions and laymen actually commit themselves to a program of plan implementation at the detailed site and program level so as to yield more than the fruitless zoning by-law mentality of the past fifty years.

Discussions with my colleagues in Government revealed similar anxieties on their part and so it was this concern which prompted me to search in other and older lands for creative environmental innovations, hows successful they were, and what kinds of values and processes prompted their realization.

In the time remaining I shall try as cogently as possible to relate to you something of these innovations and, if possible, to relate them to the Canadian scene.

Throughout this discussion I would like you to keep several points in mind:

Firstly, that I do not speak as a city and regional planner But as a member of a profession which cannot contribute meaningfully at the level of environmental design unless the house of planning is in order; secondly, that the

main thrust of my concern is not the existing city but that of literally preparing the countryside to receive the new city and to shape the country to serve not only itself but the expanding urban area as well. This is among the most serious of problems facing Ontario today and if it is not faced squarely the results are sure to be cataclysmic.

I shall deal with my experiences under five major headings: National and Regional Planning Policy, New Town Planning Policy, Rural Development and Redevelopment, Town Development Innovations, and then briefly, some Implications for Ontario and Canada.

1. National and Regional Planning Policy

There are exponents among us who feel that without national and provincial plans we shall get nowhere. Policies differ in different countries. Planning in the United Kingdom has traditionally focussed upon urban 'development plans' and 'development control' through such legal instruments as the Town and Country Acts and the Economic Planning Councils whose studies would help shape physical and economic development in the regions. The degree of control afforded in these legislative measures is achieving significant urban development control and preventing indiscriminate overspill into rural areas. I shall comment on this subject later but the main point is that the United Kingdom, while not undertaking a formal national plan, appears to be achieving planning success at the local level.

The approach taken in The Netherlands represents an example worthy of careful examination by the international community. The Dutch, in their idealistic wisdom, too, sought to develop a national plan. But after much soul-searching this pragmatic country settled instead for a National Physical Planning Policy as a response to the request by its people for "a guiding idea for a clear government policy". Specifically, this takes the form of a structural scheme or "indicative map" recognizing the junction with the European urbanization pattern, the clearly outlined hierarchy of urban centers, freedom of choice in housing and employment, junction with existing centers, facilities for traffic and public transport, contact with the rural area, relationship between housing and recreation areas, and lastly, country side. It is a policy statement the implementation of which rests with the Provincial and local authorities who are charged with the preparation of regional and local plans but in consultation with, and strong influence from, the central government. Their solution to the

Ranstad conurbation is pertinent to the problem of the Toronto-centered Region.

It is significant for us to note that after World War II The Netherlands, in arranging its national priorities, embarked on the objective of comprehensive planning and disciplined development characteristic of welfare state principles. This resulted in less consumer income for its people but, on the other hand, a wholesome environment following the difficult post-war conditions.

Belgium, on the other hand, adopted a free-wheeling, permissive approach to development which has resulted today in more abundant personal prosperity but chaotic environmental conditions.

There are lessons to be learned from the two alternative experiences.

Israel, very much like The Netherlands, has also undertaken a rather total approach to national planning. It has developed a generalized national plan for six administrative districts within which regional and local planning takes place. While not legally binding, the plans are worked out with government departments and, as in The Netherlands, are the authoritative plans for subsequent execution by the districts and regions.

The Lakhish Regional Settlement Project, which I studied, is part of this hierarchy of planning.

Crete, too, has embarked on an impressive policy of regional development of agricultural, touristic and industrial development integrated by a strong infrastructure.

2. New Town Planning Policy

As most here are acquainted with new town development in the United Kingdom there is not much that I could add. Like many others, it is my belief that they are successful within the Western context and any lack of success may be more in terms of detail which is highly useful experience to us in our own future planning.

It is worthy for us to note the reasons for success achieved in diverting growth from London and containing sprawl. These reasons are due, I believe, to a non-partisan political support of the Raison d'etre for the new town idea,

firm government leadership in the town planning and building process, and the fact that there must be reasonable return on invested income.

New town policy in The Netherlands and Israel was based upon national needs to open new areas for settlement. This gave opportunity few countries have to experiment with and implement in some detail the theory of hierarchal structure. As this principle is very much an integral consideration of The Plan for the Toronto-centered Region, the Israeli and Dutch experiences, while not parallel, may offer valuable experience in this complex aspect of regional design of already-settled areas.

3. Rural Development Redevelopment

As I pointed out earlier, it is the approach we shall adopt towards the planning and development of our rural areas which will influence, perhaps even crucially, the quality of life in existing and future urban settlement. This is so because the production of amenity and recreation, as well as food, will be an important function of rural areas.

The situation characterizing the United Kingdom is that while a large amount of expertise was deployed in urban planning and development control, the 'white areas' outside the towns were left in a static condition. However, with increasing pressures on use of rural areas for agricultural and recreational use, the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, with the later addition of the Countryside Commission and its broad powers, a great focus developed, especially in the late sixties, on country and resources planning.

There are several major items of interest in rural and regional development in the United Kingdom.

- (a) It is established that natural resources are not the pre-occupation of a single, specially-created agency. It is the collective responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Forestry Commission, the Water Resources Board, the Nature Conservancy, other similar agencies and quasi-public agencies, as well as landowners.
- (b) The British feel that if they are to conserve their countryside, they are going to have to pay for it through management agreements with the Countryside Commission. (This is in contrast

to the Dutch who feel that they should save what they can of the original countryside and then create a new rural landscape.)

- (c) The East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural beauty is a developing experiment which should be closely examined for its approach to countryside planning and management, particularly as a method for resolving resource-use conflicts, preserving countryside character and assigning levels of function to rural towns.
- (d) The Highlands and Islands Development Board project represents a forthright approach to integrated and simultaneous regional planning and development, citizen-based, and not unlike our BAEQ experience.
- (e) Access to the countryside, especially through the historical rights conveyed relative to public footpaths and bridleways, is apparently without international precedence as an instrument for countryside enjoyment on a mass scale.

In The Netherlands, the opportunity to create new lands in the IJsselmeer has been a fortuitous circumstance in affording an opportunity to experiment with consciously designed comprehensive regional structure. The opening of our own frontier areas is crude by comparison. At the same time, the development of these projects was accompanied by the recent phenomenon of agricultural over-production in the countries of the European Economic Community suggesting need, according to the Mansholt Report of the EEC, for withdrawal of ten percent of land from agricultural production. This was accompanied, too, by the usual problems of demand for countryside which is an outgrowth of increased affluence.

The response of the Dutch to this situation was sensitive and realistic. As you know, a program of land consolidation has been active in that country for some thirty-five years. But it was geared to increasing agricultural production. With the need to cut back on agriculture a bold new policy for rural planning is emerging, utilizing the sophisticated techniques developed through the land consolidation experience.

Present creation of recreation and conservation areas will be greatly expanded in The Netherlands to create forests - not for fibre production, but for recreation, and large acreages of land will be made available for second home sites. Regional parks of many thousands of acres, such as the

Spaarnwoude of the Randstad, are being created out of agricultural lands. Regional recreation structure plans are devised to be compatible with comprehensive regional plans. They are carried to a point of program and project implementation and management.

Both the old and new agricultural development projects concentrate on retaining the best of original countryside character and creating new rural landscape character through extensive programs of roadside and farm plantings, creation of conservation areas and forests, and consolidation of existing isolated forests.

Order in the countryside is a hallmark of the British and Dutch landscapes. Elements such as service stations, billboards, mineral workings and waste disposal sites are under the strictest of control through exemplary enabling legislation, regulatory services and public attitudes.

Israel, although disadvantaged by history, land resources and climate, has lodged enviable achievements. The hierarchical structure of settlement of the Lakhish region characterized by agricultural villages, service centers for four to five villages and the regional town of Qiryat Gat, is successful today although the experience is not tempered with time. Flexibility being exercised in changing the original agricultural function of the regional town is a model to be studied. Roadside tree plantings and forests on eroded mountains are momentous achievements which may, too, serve as models. Lack of eventual provision of amenity and outdoor recreation seems to have been by-passed in original plans as an integral objective.

4. Town Development Innovations

Time permits neither nominal discussion of innovations in city development or even a relatively complete listing. I have chosen, therefore, to discuss very briefly only a few highlights of my observations which may have local ramifications. Not all are new to you, but they are presented to raise discussion as to why have we not adopted them here and if they are in fact sound, what instruments and procedures should we undertake for their adaptation and implementation here.

Control of sprawl is a conspicuous feature of British and Dutch landscapes. This is evident in both old and new towns where a precise line delineates town and country. It is made possible through strong centralized planning controls and the new town policy for urban expansion.

Cellular structure of new towns is made possible through forest belts separating communities and neighborhoods, giving scale, identity and preventing continuous and monotonous urban accretion. The forests are managed by the national Forestry Commission.

Separated but integrated vehicular and pedestrian systems related to living, working, shopping and open spaces have reduced reliability on the automobile, reduced accidents by fifty percent and permit use and enjoyment of the city landscape. The town of Stevenage with a population of over 70,000 does not possess a single traffic light!

Community facilities in European countries warrant the most careful of study as prototypes to be interpreted according to Canadian conditions. De Meerpal, at Dronten in the East Flevoland polder, is one of these containing a single multiple-use space at the town center for coffee bars, restaurants (which also serve alcoholic beverages), youth and sport facilities, the weekly market, theater, cinema, convention facilities and other uses. An expanded and improved version is planned for the new city of Lelystad.

The service center villages in the Lakhish region of Israel furnish twenty different activities for children bussed in from surrounding rural villages twice weekly.

Civic facilities, including gardens, and generous budgets for art are crucial to encouraging sense of community and pride in new as well as in established communities. These, along with community facilities, should be treated as loss leaders in the initial community development phase. They should be programmed for changing functions.

Creative playgrounds properly conceived and managed under skilled leadership have demonstrated value in respect to not only child personal development, but for community action as well. The adventure playground in England is an unqualified success.

Landscape plantings at the community and individual unit level have proven to serve important roles in safety, privacy, amenity and community pride. There was an acknowledged need for extension specialists in this respect. Israel has appointed an extension specialist known as the 'Director for the Cultivation of Homes' whose responsibility includes instruction in home and neighborhood maintenance.

While the allotment garden is found the United Kingdom it has found it fullest and most sophisticated

expression in The Netherlands. Each lot features a modern, enclosed and serviced garden house and there are central club facilities. Some new allotment subdivisions are found in city parks and are created for the benefit of those who cannot leave the city for weekend recreation.

New towns in the United Kingdom are officially expected to undertake experimentation while maintaining minimum standards. This policy has resulted in valuable innovation.

The tragedies of lack of broad inter-disciplinary collaboration and the rewarding results of its practice are evident universally. Would the highly unfavorable hilltop location of Cumbernauld have been chosen if a qualified climatologist had been involved in the site selection? Would the urban forests of Stevenage have resulted if planner, architect and landscape architect had not collaborated?

Characteristic of government planning organizations in Europe is the element of broad multi-department representation.

The Physical Planning Service of The Netherlands has a landscape architectural section whose only responsibility is to act as a 'think tank'.

Would you believe - the highways department in The Netherlands will not accept responsibility for certain aspects of route location and landscape design for it is reluctant to accept the biological consequences of its work.

5. Implications for Ontario/Canada

Based on the observations I have related to you I will complete my presentation by making a series of 'one-syllable' statements related to the Canadian scene.

- (a) The Government of Canada has not exercised its responsibility in developing a national planning policy beyond that of ad hoc policies for housing, urban renewal and regional development. If there are constitutional barriers they should be hurdled to achieve this aim.
- (b) The Design for Development statements and move to regionalism on the part of the Government of Ontario should be considered as only a beginning toward either a

comprehensive, integrated Provincial Plan
or Provincial Planning Policy.

- (c) Because cities develop in rural areas, and because much of our recreational opportunities will be found there, the environment of Ontario will not improve until the same level of planning attention now prevailing in urban areas is extended to the rural areas.
- (d) Provincial and regional planning policies and programs will not be successful without the fullest possible representation from most Government Departments, the disciplines and optimal representation from the public.
- (e) Regional government will not achieve its goals unless single-purpose provincial districts are re-aligned for the purpose for formal inter-disciplinary collaboration in regional planning and development.
- (f) As planning at all levels of government has not achieved notable success in Canada, existing and future planning policy must be extended to include project implementation and management at the most specific project level. The implications of new legislative measures and regulation are clear.
- (g) Some Government Departments have not faced squarely the new realities of environmental problem-solving which is their responsibility; this includes the Departments of Agriculture, Lands and Forests, and Highways.
- (h) The problems of the state of our environment have currently reached such a stage that our political parties endanger our collective welfare without a unified non-partisan approach.
- (i) The professions and other interested groups gathered here today will not express themselves without an enabling framework.
- (j) In this age of relevance continuing cross appointments should be made between government and the universities for the benefit of the young future practitioner, the institutions and society in general.

THE PROCESS OF NEW CITY PLANNING AND BUILDING

Professor L. O. Gertler, Director, School of Urban & Regional Planning, University of Waterloo

The moving spirit behind this meeting has given me two simple guidelines: "Speak little but loudly". I have about 22 minutes. So I am going to speak somewhat more dogmatically and I hope forcefully than I would at a meeting of the Learned Societies -- and I am going to dispense both with the circumstantial background of my statement and an account of methodology. I will leave these to be inferred.

The immediate provocation of my interest in "new cities" arises out of the Provincial concept for the Toronto-Centred Region, and out of its progenitor, the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Transportation Study. The M.T.A.R.T.S. Choices report of 1967, is concerned with the restructuring of the urban settlement pattern on a regional scale. It involves the deflection of substantial growth away from the metropolitan Toronto core, and its nucleation into a network of closely inter-acting new communities distributed in two tiers along 100 miles of the Lake Ontario shoreline. This concept represents in a sense a conceptual "watershed" between a period of orderly filling in of urban development within metropolitan service limits, by numerous projects, and a period of purposeful shaping of the structure of regional development, by influencing the location, size, function and sequence of entire urban communities.

A change in development strategy of this nature presents an unprecedented challenge to our Administrative structures and planning and development processes. It is a new ball game. It behoves us to begin to work out in terms of structures and processes an approach which will be effective in a dynamic, highly urbanized region like Toronto (and other regions like it) -- taking into account the Province's economic conditions as well as political structures and traditions.

I am using the term "new city" in a special sense, which has its roots in three traditions of city building -- the British, the Scandinavian and the American. The British "new Town" is a self-contained community, large enough to ensure a high quality of services, developed on public land, independent in employment, having its own inner balance between urban activities, with business and leisure time links to other new towns and a metropolitan centre. It is usually conceived as an element in the urban development strategy of metropolitan-based regions, and has been elevated, in this regard, to an instrument of national policy.

The administrative mechanism for carrying out the new towns policy is a Development Corporation, appointed by the responsible Minister and empowered to plan, to acquire land compulsorily, to finance and to develop.

The Scandinavian tradition, as represented by the Stockholm experience, has in common with the British "model" -- a comprehensive approach to design, and the public ownership of land. It differs, however, in its sponsorship, planning and management, and in the role of the new community within the urban-centred region. The Stockholm communities, are very much the product of bottom-up, civically-based action led by social democratic regimes of the City Government. The City Administration plans, designs, finances, provides utilities and sometimes takes on the developers' role through a city-owned development company. There is no attempt to make the new communities self-sufficient in employment. Their regional position -- located not more than 30 minutes by subway from central Stockholm, assures a high degree of integration with the metropolitan area.

The development of "new cities" in the United States has been mainly undertaken by private enterprise. They tend to be planned for a population of at least 100,000, to be located within the orbit of major metropolitan centres; and to aspire to a high degree of employment independence. They are conspicuously different from either the British or Scandinavian counterparts in one very critical respect. Because they are "unique events", developing at the opportune moment when financial and market conditions are right, they do not constitute a part of a wider system of cities. Under present legislation, they do not hold out much promise of becoming a major alternative to prevailing patterns of growth. While the best of the private developers have stressed the coincidence of public benefit and private gain -- they have not yet met a decisive test. In the 1969 Annual Report of the Rouse Company, developers of Columbia, Maryland, the following objectives are found side-by-side:

"To create, by superior planning, a higher quality of life for man and his family.

To make an outstanding profit."

The question is begged whether the "commercial tail" wags the new city "dog".

Within the M.T.A.R.T.S. (or. T.C.R.) regional formulation there is the prospect of developing a type of "new city" which borrows and carries to a logical conclusion,

in a new synthesis, some of the elements of the British, Scandinavian and American traditions. It would be conceived, like the British example, as part of a strategy for directing the growth forces of a metropolitan-based region; and like that precedent would have a distinct role and community identity within the region. It would not however be self-sufficient in employment. The Scandinavian reliance on a public commuter system, backed up by a highway network, would be emulated by the facilities of the Parkway belt. Following the Stockholm pattern, regional integration of communities is the aim. Emphasis would be on the City in the region, on creating cities along a transportation corridor that form not only a single labour market but a single leisure market. To develop sub-regional centres with a wide range of high quality services, the new cities in the M.T.A.R.T.S. (T.C.R.) concept must, as in the American case reach for a substantial population level. The skill exhibited by the best of the American "new city" developers, suggests a unique challenge to the Canadian process: to harness enterprise in "new city" development, in a manner which is sufficiently sustained -- and precise in timing, function and location, to make the "new city" not an accident of the market, nor as William Alonso and Paul Hellyer suggest merely a laboratory for urban experiment, but as part of a system of cities, a genuine alternative to prevailing patterns of growth.

Having defined "new city" in a somewhat special way the question arises whether the term "city" is appropriate, and "borough" has been suggested as an alternative. According to my dictionary of Canadian English "borough" is associated in some way with an area of local government -- and that does not quite fit. I will stick with "city" because it is a word of great historical depth, with strong spiritual overtones -- suggesting, as Mumford has expressed it "a theater of social action an aesthetic symbol of collective unity". The new areas of urban concentration in the Toronto-centred region must be more than undifferentiated slices of urban tissue.

In responding to the challenge of "new city" planning and development we can appeal to the cumulative experience of such development in a number of countries, including the aforementioned, and to a degree to Canadian experience which is not too helpful because it has taken the form mainly of resource-based frontier towns.

It is possible to distil out of such experience, in spite of its diversity, a certain set of problems which constitute the special requirements of "new city" development.

These are:

- (i) to find the capital for acquiring substantial amounts of land and financing the basic utilities, transportation networks and social services (e.g. hospitals and schools) before a tax base has been created.
- (ii) to suppress the tendency of a large urban development to produce, by raising expectations, a level of land prices that is prohibitive.
- (iii) to initiate, before development, and to sustain throughout a lengthy development period an effective planning process.
- (iv) to create by skillful design the best qualities of spontaneous growth, while attaining a high standard of functional efficiency.
- (v) to find a way of administering the development of the on-going affairs of the city which is effective in a technical sense, and responsive to residents, without unduly discounting the future,
- (vi) and, additionally, in an area like the Toronto C.R., to divert powerful growth forces from accustomed to new patterns of development.

Each country that has embarked on "new city" development has responded to these requirements in its own distinctive way. This is the case even in the nordic countries that have much in common. In these the vehicle for "new city" planning and development varies from a voluntary Housing Foundation in Helsinki, to the City Administration in Stockholm, and to a State-created planning committee in Copenhagen. These differences in structure notwithstanding, it is possible to observe a common denominator amongst the various new city approaches, in the Development and planning process. Generally, there has emerged, a six-phase process: (i) Comprehensive Plan, (ii) Financial Plan and Program, (iii) Land Assembly and Management (iv) Urban Design, (v) Staging and Construction, and (vi) Government and Administration.

To think through the application of this process to Ontario, I have tried to relate the cumulative lore of "new city" planning to a set of very specific conditions and circumstances, namely Oakville North, a proposed new city of 180,000 within the boundaries of Oakville, (4 to 5 miles from the present town centre), and within the Goals Plan II

framework of M.T.A.R.T.S. (or T.C.R., Zone 1). And then, through what Sir Geoffery Vickers calls an 'appreciative system' to indicate the discrepancies between those conditions and the hypothesized requirements of each phase of the process, with a view to suggesting changes in the present processes and institutional arrangements.

Large-scale land assembly in the Oakville area -- about 14,000 acres will be required, will have to contend with a market, already heavily influenced by investment and speculative forces. In Ward 1, the 48,000 acre area, N. of Upper Middle Road which contains the proposed site and its environs, the following has been established (as of the fall of 1969).

61% of the land is already in the "investment category, i.e. absentee-owned farm and residential land.

Real estate transactions have increased 3 times in the five year period, 1964-69.

Land prices have risen 5 times -- from an average of about \$500 to \$2600 per acre, and

Titles to land are substantially fragmented -- about 64% of the acreage is in parcels under 100 acres, and of these about 22% are in parcels under 50 acres.

The planning function in the Town of Oakville is relatively well established -- it extends back to 1943; it has a small but professionally expert planning staff that has provided Council with the standard instruments for guiding the community's development. There are some constraints on its future role -- some external such as the debt limits of the Municipal Act, and the lack of inter-municipal coordinating machinery at the County and inter-County level; and some internal, particularly the Official Plan which confines development to the area south of the proposed Highway 403 alignment, and thereby precludes the "new city" site. Generally the Town has good capacity to handle "normal" urban growth, but (not surprisingly), it is not equipped professionally, financially, or legislatively to undertake the planning and development of a "new city".

To meet the challenge of a concept like the Toronto-Centred Region Design, I suggest a New Cities Act for Ontario, which would spell out the responsibilities

and powers and relationships of each agency in the "new city" structure of administration. The broad provincial interest would reside, (a) in determining the general framework of development -- the location, size, function and development sequence of new cities; (b) in establishing a land policy that prevents the inflation of land prices becoming a barrier to desirable urban patterns; (c) in making available some of the loan capital required to overcome the initial hump of public investment; (d) in assuring that the new cities through their various phases of planning and development have a sound administrative base; and (e) in rendering technical assistance, particularly on land and financial aspects, where it may be required.

The top of the pyramid within the Provincial Administration is seen as the Advisory Committee on Regional Development because of its central coordinating role on development matters in the Province.

The main executive arm of the Province is seen as a new agency, the Office of new City Planning and Development which is located in the Department of Municipal Affairs. This should be a new function with a staff assembled for its special knowledge and expertise in the problems of large-scale urban development.

The central principle of the proposed structure, is that the locus of responsibility be placed in a New City Administration within an existing unit of regional administration, preferably a regional government. The N.C.A. would have both executive and staff components. Its Board would represent the interests most directly involved: the regional government, itself; constituent local governments if they exist; special agencies like a Conservation Authority; representative citizens associations; the Director of Planning for the N.C.A.; major private developers and the residents of the New City. The direct representation of residents on the Board is important, because for many years as a small minority within the Region there would be a risk of their submergence and alienation if they were not provided the opportunity to play a part in the management of the affairs of the New City -- and of course they have a positive role to play as an aspect of "feedback" in the development process. In this regard, the practise of the Columbia of Association, which owns and manages all the public lands and facilities the new city, provides for representation of the residents on the Board of Directors on the basis of one for each 4,000 dwelling units -- with a corresponding drop in Rouse Company representation to the point where the Board is eventually 100% under residents' control.

Emphasis on the regional role arises out of the opportunities opened up by the emerging framework of regional government. If that reform is to mean more than simply raising present local governments, with all their limitations, to a larger unit of activity, it will require that the new regional regimes become the means for the people of these areas to positively shape their own environments. Assuming this role will call for a new order of maturity. It is not at all consistent with narrow parochial politics -- "you scratch my back and I will scratch yours"; but the consequences of not assuming this role, which would unquestionably be a more centralist solution along the lines of the British development corporations, ought to carry conviction in this Province with its strong local government traditions. In the western world, the example of Stockholm indicates the potential for achieving both entrepreneurial skill and imagination through a municipal organization. To encourage this possibility in the Ontario context it is suggested that the new city administration have a high degree of executive autonomy within broad policies of Planning and Finance agreed to by the Regional Council.

The functions assigned to "Ottawa" are in line with its place in the federal structure. Inherently, the Federal Government must have the broadest view of development in the country, e.g. on population patterns, on the relationship of urban growth to inter-regional differences in living standards, and so on. While its research and conceptual leadership would be important, its main operational role would be financial. It is not suggested however, that financial support be used as a basis for adding yet another layer to the "new city" planning process. Partly to avoid this kind of Federal posture, but also for other substantial reasons, it is suggested that the Federal Government take legislative initiative for establishing a Canadian Urban Development Bank. This is an idea for which I am largely indebted to Professor Eric Beecroft. The concept is of an organization which would assemble both public and private institutional capital to support the infrastructure -- roads, utilities, services, of large scale urban development. It would be designed to permit any province to participate and in those instances, a provincial branch would be established. The basis for the participation of banks, trusts and insurance companies is the change in the character of investment requirements in the urban economy. Concepts such as the Toronto-centred policy are symptomatic of a new phase of urban development in Canada, in which communities through their public agencies are attempting to assume control of these major elements of urban development, (that affect the character and quality of urban life). Accordingly,

there is a need for our financial institutions to supplement the established forms of participation in the urban process -- such as mortgage financing and bond purchases, with a more direct commitment to improving the quality of our urban performance. The investments of the Urban Development Bank would be in the nature of foundation investment that underpin the security of all other private investments in the urban economy.

The administrative structure that I have outlined is sound only if it serves well to accommodate the six-phase "new city" planning and development process. This is a judgement which cannot yet be made conclusively. Each phase -- whether it is Comprehensive Planning or Financing, represents a complex of objectives, work tasks, organizational requirements and personnel; and is a study in itself. The structure must also accommodate the dynamics of the process, seen as two streams of activity; technical processes and government actions, and the contacts between the two processes that take the form of discussion, reports and recommendations, and the responses thereto. To get at the guts of the problem of fashioning a suitable structure, we have to identify certain salients -- certain key events occurring in an orderly sequence that move the process forward towards its fulfillment in a new community. My diagram of the process suggests -- 11 such salients. I will take the time now to comment on only one of these -- the assembly of land.

The problems represented by this phase are suggested by the market conditions of the Oakville area, where even without a firm commitment to the new city and in an agricultural zone some of the symptoms of speculative fever are already present. We are faced with the classical double-barrelled dilemma that arises when land is needed for a public purpose in a market society. On the one hand, land values increase above existing use value as a result of the growth of the community, but the increment accrues to the individual owner. On the other hand, the community as land purchaser must pay a substantial premium when it acquires land for a public purpose. Consequently, there hangs over such ambitious undertakings as "new city" development, the spectre that either prices will be prohibitive, or too great a burden of debt will be imposed on future residents. The whole process could be stopped right there -- before in any sense, it gets off the ground.

In dealing with this dilemma, I am in a position to go into a little depth, because as a by-product of the new cities study, I initiated and supervised a Master's

thesis on Land Issues in the Process of New Town Building, by Ian C. Bender. The conclusions of the thesis which I will relate in a moment were considerably influenced by experience in Great Britain, which over the past 40 years has been through several cycles of policy shifts in search of a sound land policy. Without going into details, let me say that the British Act of 1947 that nationalized development rights broke down because of unanticipated inflationary effects; and the Act of 1950 that reestablished open market values tied to development permission was highly discriminatory in its impact on landowners. And the administration of both policies -- and their subsequent variants, involved the problem of different standards of treatment for owners involved in private and public transactions; and the injurious impact on owners, at the point in time when policies were established or changed. Bearing these lessons in mind, the Bender strategy is as follows:

1. Land policies should be based upon four guidelines: (i) equality of treatment to all owners of land, whether involved in a private or public transaction, including expropriation; (ii) land for new towns and other public purposes must be made available to the community at reasonable and economic prices; (iii) further speculation in land must be discouraged or eliminated, and (iv) changes in policy must be carried out in such a way that serious loss or hardship is not inflicted upon present landowners.
2. The Province of Ontario should pass legislation defining a land policy, administered by a semi-autonomous body, such as an Ontario Land Board.
3. The O.L.B. should establish a ceiling price on the sale of undeveloped land for the entire province -- at a level that approximates the maximum value of agricultural land in Ontario; and the ceiling price should apply equally to private and public sales, and to expropriations.
4. The ceiling price should be adjusted annually in response to the cost-of-living index.
5. At the same time, a market value should be established by the O.L.B. for all undeveloped land, representing the full development value -- accrued say to 1970, and adjusted at 5 year intervals.

6. For a period of 20 years following the establishment of a ceiling price, full development value would be guaranteed to each vendor of land, with the difference between the ceiling price and market value being paid by the government through a special fund established for this purpose.
7. After the twenty year period, development value would cease to be paid.

This is a long-run, Fabian approach dictated by the need for trading off private and public interests in land. In the immediate future, its advantages for the "new city" planning process would be twofold: the new communities would not be saddled with disproportionate debts and a high structure of costs; and price levels and speculative investments would tend to be held in check by the establishment of market values administratively, and by the psychic impact, increasing year by year, of the prospective agriculturally-oriented ceiling price, at the target date.

Before concluding, I wish to draw your attention to an implication, which will be of particular interest to this meeting -- and that is the need to give special attention to personnel requirements, not only in terms of the numbers needed to sustain a serious new cities program, but in terms of the diversity of talents, and the requirements of cooperative work between many specialists. Heikki von Hertzen, the moving spirit behind Tapiola and the Housing Foundation of Finland, expressed himself on this subject in a letter written to me last April -- as follows:

"I would like to mention that almost all staff members and experts had to be re-educated in the techniques of team-work, in the overall way of thinking and attitude. We had to train real community planners from budding technocrats and bureaucrats. The greatest handicap was that we could not find in the whole country an expert who could have been considered an urban sociologist of the type of Louis Mumford, in miniature scale -- of course."

In conclusion, let me state very briefly a few observations. The first is that "new city" development should be an aspect of Provincial policy: the broad framework questions of where? when? how big? what purposes? should be established at the Provincial level. The second is that the planning and building of new cities should be integrated

with the evolving structure of municipal government; hence the placing of responsibility for the process in an agency of regional government. The third principle is that within the structure of regional government, recognition must be given to the special needs of the planning and development process, namely Capital, Planning, Land Assembly, Participation and Development Control. And finally, the "new city" planning process is an inter-governmental process, requiring participation from the local to the federal level.

One of the beneficial by-products of the operation of these four principles is that at the stage when a new city becomes well established we will not be left with a bureaucratic residue that becomes a problem, an expense and an embarrassment after it has outlived its usefulness: "new city" development becomes absorbed into the on-going municipal process.

THE DIALOGUE BEGINS

Chairman: Nigel Richardson

In continuation of the presentations made by Professors Chanasyk and Gertler, the following picks up the discussion Segment of the Dialogue.

CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we have been fortunate in hearing two extremely stimulating speakers, and I am quite sure all of you will agree. One pointed out some of the things that have been accomplished on the other side of the Atlantic and asked, in effect, why we can't do that kind of thing here. The other made some positive suggestions as to how we might, in fact, build cities better in the future.

I think we are equally fortunate in the members of our panel. We have been lucky to persuade to come here this afternoon, four people, who, among them constitute an extremely able and at the same time extremely well balanced and diversified group. I hope they will pardon me if I introduce them, as I did with the two main speakers collectively and very briefly, in order not to take up too much time of the discussion period. In this era of women's liberation I am going to duck arguments about precedence by introducing the panelists in strict alphabetical order and unfortunately that puts the lady right at the end.

First, we have Joe Barnicke, the President of J.J. Barnicke Limited, who, I believe, likes to be regarded as a specialist in creative real estate and can also be regarded as the father of the Sherway Shopping Centre. Next, Mr. Hans Blumenfeld, who really doesn't need any introduction at all; certainly one of the most eminent teachers, writers and practitioners of planning on this continent. Next, Mr. Don Middleton, a member of the Ontario Land Compensation Board and a former Executive Director of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. And finally, Mrs. June Rowlands, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Community Housing Committee and past Chairman of the Citizens' Housing Committee, who has for a long time been extremely active in the field of housing and inner-city renewal.

I have asked the panelists not to prepare or present formal statements or papers, but to react and respond to what they have heard and you have heard so far this afternoon. I am however, going to give each one in turn, again in strict alphabetical order, the opportunity to make a few comments for, I hope, not more than five minutes at the outside -- less if possible. And after that, I am going to ask them simply to discuss among themselves what they have heard and their reactions to it and I rather hope we get a nice little argument out of it. So without any further ado - Mr. Barnicke please!

JOE BARNICKE:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. From what I have just heard, I guess I am one of the fellows on the other side of the fence. I think the problem I have encountered and the experiences that I have had is the lack of theory and Canadian policy for Canada in planning. And I summarize it this way. We are living in one economy whereas in Sweden, England, and in Israel, they are living in a completely different economy. I have been in Israel and I think they are doing a fabulous job. First of all they had nothing but huts to start with and the Yankee dollar. Now huge bulldozers, high-rise apartments and road systems are going in like you would never see elsewhere. Inner and outer ring roads link the apartments and districts together. They are building these apartments on hills all over the country. Israel is a country of limestone rock with limited vegetation, so they are starting from virgin territory but if the Yankee dollar wasn't there subsidizing the government's program, they would be bankrupt in a week. So you can't compare that situation to Canada because of its socialist principles and because it is highly subsidized(USA). But to look at it, it is beautiful planning. And, of course, if you've got a bank with you, you can do anything.

In Sweden and England, I think their problem is the scarcity of land and therefore the need to regulate its use. Sweden also takes a socialistic attitude - if the planning policy directs the growth of the city to the east, although your relatives live in the west, you must live in the east. As a result - social problems arise but I am not knowledgeable enough to discuss them. In England, of course, you must operate through the county council system. Now, I think the problem we face in planning which causes the biggest criticism is that until recently we did not have adequate planning schools in Canada. I think we are in great need of them. The Universities of Waterloo, Toronto, British Columbia, Queen's, Guelph and Montreal are under way but with a dominance of the British system based on the county form of government. We are a buoyant community; we are a growth community; we are under populated; and I think our philosophy should be based on growth principles rather than control. In our system, the Municipal Board is forcing us to adhere explicitly to official plans rather than use them as a guide line, flexible enough to anticipate the unexpected growth and changes in urban development. The present procedures to determine whether changes can be made are frustratingly difficult. In dealing with Sherway, The

Rouse Company who are also the owners of Columbia, I became quite conversant with the development process that created Columbia. They initially assembled 16,000 acres at the average price of \$1,600 an acre, a fairly low price and a good land assembly. It is located half way between Baltimore and Washington. Here, if you ever try to assemble at that price, you might as well quit before you start. They had one large institution behind them and as they needed more money, they had to have three more large ones, like the big banks from New York. But it was a good, fast assembly and they had large cities on both sides as magnets. While the core of Toronto is one base, we do not have another major city to use as another anchor. The point I am trying to make is that as well as dealing with the theory of the planners we have, there is a great need for planners trained in the more venturesome environment of United States. There are more jobs than a variety of people available and, as a result, Canada is weighted heavily with the British-trained planner trained under a socialistic system. Take for example, the Metropolitan Toronto Development Department. When it started a few years ago, it had sixty planners all of them out of the English system. Now, therefore, I think in our Ontario and Canadian situations, we should create our own planners for our own society and our own environment rather than carry-over the social approach and forms of behaviours from a country not related to the growth in a country such as Canada. I think, as openers, that is about all I have to say for now.

H. BLUMENFELD

There are several points that I might refute. One is that people like solitude and they don't like noise. Well, they do like solitude but they also like crowds and I am not so sure about all people not liking noise. I remember when I was in Moscow my institution proposed to me to go to the city of Gorki, which I did. I asked one of my draftsmen who lived there - what kind of a city is it? He said, "It is a nice city, Shumny", which literally means a noisy city. And the question of liveliness cannot be quite neglected. Then of course, there is this question of sprawl. Well, sprawl is one of those words which is very popular because it has a very unequivocal emotional sense - everybody knows it is bad - and a very, very intellectual definition. What is clear about sprawl, what is meant, is that it eats up some of the countryside and usually where we need agricultural land. But, V. Stranovick's statement is interesting, that even in Europe they at present try to reduce agricultural production which of course, the U.S. has been doing for a long time and Canada is now doing also. The reason why we want to preserve the countryside is really its recreational value. And I found it interesting that it is not quite enough to protect it from urban development but you have to protect its amenity value, which is not necessarily always an agriculturally productive one. Highly mechanized, large-scale, agricultural landscapes can be quite dull and of course it is in all cases, quite inaccessible - it is all fenced around with barbed wire.

I believe that one of the means to curtail the encroachment on the landscape and the overspill, as the British call it, of the city into the country, and two of the main reasons why it goes so far here, is connected with our habit of building and living in single family houses and of moving around almost exclusively in automobiles. We could avoid a great deal of overspill and have a much more compact development if we were to have more multi-family dwellings and greater reliance on rail transportation. I found in a recent study, a comparison between the city of Metropolitan Toronto and my home town of Hamburg, Germany. Although the population sizes were the same, Hamburg is over 75 per cent multi-family buildings and has developed very strongly on a rail rapid transportation system. Surprisingly, the overspill really has gone farther there than it has gone here. Now it has gone in a more desirable form and has urbanly developed land and has rural land and they have been held more together.

These are the two elements really which are thought of under the concept of sprawl: one is low density development,

and there is probably a strong, quite understandably, desire of people, not necessarily of all people, to live at low density.

The second is "scatteration" or what we usually call leap-frogging, when somewhere on the open landscape somebody acquired some acres and started development quite separate from the existing urban development. We call it leap-frogging and consider it to be bad. Only when the frog is big enough and leaps far enough then we call him a new town - and then he is good.

Now we have heard a lot about new towns, and I do not want to engage in semantics, but I think it is significant to realize that the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands - well the Netherlands have done it in their new polders. It is a different thing - that is really a resort town like our resort towns. But otherwise they have not gone into a new town policy and therefore still prefer the town-like satellite borough for places like Stockholm, Vallingby or Tapiola. Of course they are extensions of the existing cities - planned extension, rather than unplanned extension as we have. But very definitely something very different from the concept of a self-controlled new town.

What I think is important in all three types of new towns or new boroughs - the British, the Scandinavian, and the American - is that the whole area is and remains in one ownership. I think this is really the crucial point and I think in our Ontario case I would certainly be in favour of there being one public ownership.

But the second point which is important is why the British and Scandinavian and Dutch developments are successful as a whole and are socially desirable. It is quite evident there are undesirable aspects of American new towns despite all the good intentions of the developer. Without national housing policies, which Britain and the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries all have, which allow the great majority of the population to live as owners or renters in new housing; without such a policy, these new towns inevitably become glorified middle-class suburbs increasing the class segregation between suburb and central city which is one of the main reasons - one of the main shortcomings - of our development.

I don't see that we can avoid this in Canada without or prior to a national housing policy which is very different from our present one, which says we have public housing, but what we actually have developed so far, are some token developments of a limited access housing which inevitably become poor people's ghettos.

So I think we have to realize that there are preconditions to a healthy urban development. The question of land acquisition is of course very critical. As far as I understood Mr. Gertler's proposal on land it amounts to a freezing on the value and after twenty years really amounts to expropriation of the development value. I don't quite see how this can be made politically acceptable, especially the second half of it.

I am entirely in favour of the urban development bank but municipalities once they have established new towns or whatever they have established, will have to pay back and they will need a financial and income basis which they now don't have. So to repeat: preconditions of urban development better than the one we have now: first, public land ownership; second, adequate financial resources for municipalities; third, a national housing policy; and fourth, a Metropolitan government which comprises the actual city with the actual area which is one labour market and one housing market rather than being split up into a number of competing municipalities.

DON MIDDLETON:

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that I was invited here to represent the rural view. After hearing Len Gertler I think he is on a make-work program for the Land Compensation Board, which disturbs me just a little bit. I would, however, like to primarily deal with the rural view and I don't expect that I will say anything new, except to put in perspective the fact that you're talking about the people I used to work for who happen to own quite a bit of the land you want. You are really trying to discuss a painless process by which you can sucker us out of it without paying for it: and that comes very near to being the statement of the problem. And I would only caution you to say that it won't happen easily. Jimmy Gardiner in the 1940's persuaded us to take low prices for our food in view of the fact that he would look after us after the war, and he got himself engaged in a subsidy program. We still have some bits and pieces of it. To make up for what they have managed to take from us, we have been given an alternative that now we can accrue capital in our land without paying tax on it; that has been a nice feature up until the present time. And at some time when we want to retire we can cash the whole bloody thing in. And in total you have had a pretty good life. The trouble is that you have only made 3 per cent on your capital while you went along - so you have to make 150 on the way out. And that seems like a pretty fair approach to land ownership.

Now that in a nutshell is the attitude of the average rural person with his land. You tried in the last ten years to tax us into submission with education taxes, and we screamed bloody wrath about that and got 25 per cent off, you know. I think that would go with the Israeli policy, perhaps. In getting the 25 per cent off it is at this point that I tend to go with Victor Chanasyk and a bit with Len Gertler, that I think, as citizens of Ontario, we should have got a little bit in exchange for the 25 per cent; that is a little bit of public access to some of this private land either by agreement or by control. You are getting a little of it. The Minister of Agriculture, I see this last week, has extended the capital grants program to cover farm vacations - that is a nice deal - he will finance us while you come and pay your way on the farm. But that I think, is a step in the right direction. It is, in a sense, making some of the privately-held land at least in one way or another available for public use and providing some of the open space we should have.

There is only one other comment that I would like to make, and it is in particular with respect to Len's proposal that in setting up a new town you really lay on the structure and then by a process of evolution you give over the control. I would just caution you that out of the experience of agriculture in many of its boards and structures it is very easy to lay on the control but it is very difficult to give over the responsibility. My view is that if you intend to have the citizens responsible you start in the beginning, not after you have kept them on the bottle for six or eight years. It is a pretty simple approach but if they are going to be responsible they start in at the beginning; they don't start after you've got the whole thing set up.

On the matter of the Ontario Land Board and the matters of the cost being prohibitive I would like to make a little confession - I don't know whether the press is here or not - I worked from 1962 until 1968 as a lobbyist in the Federation of Agriculture to get an Expropriation Procedures Act through that would protect the poor, innocent little land-owner who is expropriated by the Crown. I am now sitting on a Board that became part of that Act and the thing that surprises me is that I see very few poor, innocent, unsuspecting, unbeguiled little owners - I see a great batch of people who are otherwise known as developers and they don't seem near as innocent as the people I was working for. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JUNE ROWLANDS

Our chairman spoke in his opening remarks of the agonizing re-appraisal that is going on at all levels of government, and this of course, is nowhere more evident or more needed than in our approach to urban renewal and the renewal of the

worn-out areas of our large cities. As we expend energy thinking through the concept of new cities, I think that we simply cannot afford to forget what is happening in the interior of our cities with their very large low-income populations. I share Professor Blumenfeld's fear of the new cities that will become almost inevitably middle-class ghettos; if we take Professor Michelson's warning seriously, that enforced relocation or dislocation sets up a psychiatric syndrome more direct than any other pressure of environment, and especially when we are dealing with populations that are different from the middle-class norms.

As we approach the problems of the cities we have got to start sorting out our priorities, thinking through our goals and developing policies that will enable us to reach these goals. We have got to decide for whom we are renewing the core of the city; is it for the community-at-large, is it for the populations that live there; do families in fact, have the right to remain in the inner city? We have our city council here in Toronto which is trying to find an uneasy balance between the need for a sound tax base and a feeling of responsibility - a half-hearted responsibility - toward the populations, the low income populations that are inevitably going to be displaced.

I was very interested in the first set of slides - they were beautiful pictures - there just weren't any people in them. It rather impressed me that this was, of course, in very direct contrast to any picture you might take in our cities. And I think that we have to keep this in mind; people do like green spaces; they also like cities and the activity and the excitement and the movement that is going on there.

When we move into the area of urban renewal, and of course we are developing this brave new concept that we are not going to raze and rebuild; we are going to rehabilitate. The only problem is that there is no way to do this. We are running right up against barriers and there appears at the present time to be no solution. I have been involved in one very small area in Toronto, the Trefann Court area, for a number of years, and here, reluctantly, governments are indicating that there will be funding for rehabilitation of housing which is available for this kind of treatment. But there is no way of keeping this housing in the stock for low-income people. And this is what is happening in the city. Areas that for years have housed low-income people are becoming middle-class areas as housing is rehabilitated, and there is no way to keep it within the stock available to these populations, and the result is, of course, that there is tremendous pressure on them. The quality of housing to some extent has improved; but as the junk is moved away and moved out, the rents that people are having to pay are becoming a greater and greater proportion of their income.

As we talk about the need for developing a housing policy the problem that we are facing today, is the result of this very fragmented approach and simply reacting to problems as they arrive. I think that is everything for the moment.

I was just interested in Professor Gertler's remarks about land assembly and his rather magnificent design and I was wondering how some of this could be applied to Malvern* where some of the problems, of course, wouldn't have to be faced as that land was picked up at \$440 to \$800 an acre and most of it was expropriated. It sat around for years and of course the policy of the government now is to sell that land at market - not at anything near cost. I was interested to know what comments you might have on this.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much June. I think it would be fair to give the two main speakers a chance to reply to any of the points that have been raised which they may care to comment on. So, Vic, would you care to comment on what has been said.

VIC CHANASYK

Thank you. I will make just a very few remarks because there are people in front of us that wish to say something. In respect to Mr. Barnicke's statement that Israel could not have done what she has done without Yankee dollars - I agree with that. But the fact of the matter is that we are either the second or the third most affluent country in the world and it seems that we could do an awful lot better with our own dollars than what we are doing at the present time.

In respect to Mr. Blumenfeld's statement - I am not sure whether he knows me well enough - he did teach urban and regional planning for me at the University of Guelph. I rather think that he missed what I was getting at by "sprawl." I was forced to deal in simplistic terms and I indicated that people wanted solitude. But Mr. Blumenfeld, I also indicated that people like people up to a certain point. And in direct response to this business of sprawl, I would just take one case in point: If you approach any city of 50,000 people today, you would have to go through two miles of gas stations, garages, pitch-and-put things, hamburger stands and so on. This is the kind of thing that I think can be eliminated. This is the kind of thing that has been eliminated by the more disciplined approach in towns such as in the United Kingdom, in the Netherlands and in Israel.

In respect to Mr. Middleton's statement, I don't think that the capital grants program announced by the Minister is

*Malvern Housing Project within the Borough of Scarborough

really going to do an appreciable amount for enjoyment of the countryside. It is going to provide primarily, unless I am mistaken, an opportunity for annual vacations. What I was really getting at in access to the countryside was that people should have a day-to-day opportunity, particularly on weekends, to get out to the countryside such as is possible in the United Kingdom. I am sorry, Mrs. Rowlands, that there were not more pictures of people in my photographs. I was at that point concentrating on the countryside and I found it rather embarrassing to photograph people enjoying the countryside from any close distance, but I assure you there were people there. (Laughter)

JUNE ROWLANDS

There were people there! I wondered if you were there at dawn or something!

VIC CHANASYK

There were people there. They were parked in open fields. They were parked on rights-of-ways and it was quite a job selecting the few slides from the 2,000 photographs.

CHAIRMAN

Len, would you like to make any comment?

LEN GERTLER

Yes, if I may. Just picking up a few points made by the speaker: First, to Mr. Barnicke, in connection with his observations on the British product in the planning profession, I would like to tell him, as gently and as kindly as possible, that he is deluding himself if he thinks that the new Canadian product is going to be, let's say, more tender in his feelings about certain excesses in our society. I can tell you that he will make the British planner look like a cross between Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill. And it is not, you know, because we are a bunch of rabble-rousers in a university. But it is happening in some mystical way there - there is a great deal of ferment amongst the Canadian-bred planning students and the soon-to-be planners.

But on another point, in regard to the issue of public and private and so on, one thing I feel for certain, we should not get this discussion down to a question of good guys and bad guys and the saints in the centre. That really isn't the point at all and I am sorry if I conveyed that impression. I'd cite the posture of James Rouse himself as a posture which I feel makes the greatest sense in the kind of free enterprise economy in which we live, because Rouse, having pulled off a very neat one with Columbia, has declared in a

very emphatic way that he could not do it again in an area such as the Washington-Baltimore corridor, and that in fact, he needs certain support from public policy if this worthwhile experiment is to be repeated. In other words, the new city is to be more than just an occasional thing but another one of the forms of development that we have in our development repertoire. And he is on the record before the American Congress in this respect in no uncertain way.

With regard to Hans' (Blumenfeld) points, there are a couple of things I would like to pick up. One is this danger of the new town becoming a middle-class suburb. Of course, it is true there is plenty of experience to point to that danger. I think as he suggests, that housing policy is very much at the guts of the issue. You know, if you examine any of these cases you find that some very specific things have been done to prevent a miscarriage in this aspect of the social composition of a new community. In the case of Sweden, for example, Canadian politicians often point with some appreciation towards the policy. I believe that Paul Hellyer in his report on housing - the famous Task Force Report - did have some nice things to say about the Swedish housing policy... commenting on the fact that you help the person and not the landlord. But he forgot to mention that a part of that strategy has been rent control; that in the case of Sweden, to prevent the shifting of the advantage from the individual to the landlord there has had to be rent control. Now I am not espousing rent control, but I am just trying to point out to you that this business of achieving social objectives is not a tea party and that there are some very specific things that have to be done.

In the case of Tapiola in Finland, also, they have worked out a financial mechanism with the banks which permits a would-be resident to begin to build up his equity several years before he comes into the town and they have done this specifically to assure, as they say, that 45 per cent of the population will be blue-collar people. On one point concerning the proposals on land, of course I'm flying a kite here - Ian Bender is flying a kite - I feel that it is high time that we had some basic discussion on this issue which we have evaded for so long in this country. I am sure that this is not the solution but I just want to clarify one or two points. With regard to freeze, it is a qualified freeze in the sense that I am suggesting that for the twenty-year period that a market value be operative as far as the compensation to the individual owner is concerned. Only that market value would not find its place in the cost structure development because the development value, part of it - would be assumed out of a fund.

Then, of course, there is the question of justice involved here which is implied by Hans' remark - either justice or political feasibility - I am not sure which. But if it is a question of justice if you turn the situation around, you could look at it by saying that every day now values created by the community are being expropriated by private owners.... and so which is the greater justice?

Now with regard to the remarks of my learned colleague Mr. Middleton. You know, I was just beginning to respond to your pleas on behalf of the landowner but then you pierced it by your last remarks. I was just beginning to think of asking you to substantiate the image of the sturdy man behind the plough, when you more or less took the ground from under me with your last remarks - and I think perhaps those are eloquent enough.

Now on the question of the ideas concerning participation. I think perhaps my point did not quite get across. What I am suggesting is that as soon as residents arrive on the scene that they be represented on the board of the new city administration. I don't know if that is the point you are referring to.

DON MIDDLETON:

It doesn't satisfy me. I think they have to help put it there. They aren't there.

LEN GERTLER:

They aren't there yet.

DON MIDDLETON:

But in some meaningful way. If you go to the finished concept that is starting to pay in before you move in ---- this is some involvement so that there is a commitment at the outset.

LEN GERTLER:

Let me say I mentioned this Columbia case not because it is such a good model - they are having trouble with this despite the apparent generosity of it. The people who are there now don't feel it is enough - they don't really have enough of the action.

With regard to Mrs. Rowlands, I really am a bit puzzled if I might say so because you indicated that the new communities would become middle-class ghettos - you indicated that the inner areas are becoming middle-class ghettos - where the devil are the working class going?

JUNE ROWLANDS:

That is precisely the problem.

LEN GERTLER:

Okay. Well the thing is this - we shouldn't only sit here and admire the social democracies of Sweden and Finland and so on - we have to have a little faith in our own social democracy.

JOE BARNICKE:

You could probably use the word capitalism, a democratic free-wheeling democracy, and I think we are getting too much socialism and that is what we are faced with. Our whole economy is not yet geared to socialism. This is where our problems are. A computer will only answer what you put into it. My feeling is that you can't put in controlled planning if your whole country - your whole province's economy - is not subject to controlled planning.

As I have said about the planner - they want tight control; take the Metropolitan Toronto Regional Plan - the provincial government has come out in the open and said if you will move east we will subsidize you - we will do anything we can to induce you to go from here to Oshawa. Yet nobody is in a hurry to get there, and nobody has yet asked what the subsidy would be. If he did ask for a large one, he would probably get it. Think of what it is doing to the social environment, forcing people to live where they don't want to live. The preference is towards the northwest and if people want to live there, I don't think you should be forced into what we might call middle-class ghettos. If people want to live in the west, let them live in the west. Nobody yet has taken up the Province of Ontario's offer to subsidize.

DON MIDDLETON:

Then I take it on that point. You wouldn't agree to making penalties for going north-west? And rather than paying you to go east, penalize you if you go north-west.

JOE BARNICKE:

Well, I think right now you have your example and it is a penalizing type of system. I am not here advocating that the government should not control. For example, speculators gobbled up everything above No. 7 Highway to Hogg's Hollow and there was hardly a farm there that wasn't

picked up. They bought from a farmer gave him \$25,000 down or whatever the price was - \$3,000 to \$8,000 an acre. The farmer took his \$25,000 bought himself a small house in Brampton or somewhere, sold his cows and his farm and equipment. Then when the clamp was put on, the deposit was forfeited; they couldn't carry it because it is now sterilized land. You can drive up Dufferin Street, or any road north of No. 7 Highway and there isn't a farm that does not have three or four 'for sale' signs, at any price, the farmer had his land back. Here is the poor farmer, he has bought a house with his \$25,000, - and furniture and a new car. Now he has no cows - and yet he is back with the farm.

The same thing with Century City. Developers paid around \$1,800 an acre. The land wasn't worth any more than \$300 or \$400 an acre. The farmers got deposits in excess of \$500 an acre on the average. And now the farmer says to the government 'bail us out for that extra \$1,300 an acre' even if he got more than his land was worth in the first place. Who is right? I think under the new assessment system where you pay taxes on the value, the penalty for being out in the west end is enough.

H. BLUMENFELD:

Somewhat similar to this was found through Municipal research in Mississauga ---- prices for all will come down quite a bit and land assembly will not be so difficult really - it will not necessarily be so difficult by any form of expense. The real obstacle pertaining to the form of single family houses in this area is not land speculators but is the municipal policy, because municipalities don't want low income families with children for whom they have to pay school taxes, and this is why I think really distribution of revenues and responsibilities between municipalities and the higher levels of government is absolutely the clue to any improved form of development in Canada.

I know several years ago, the Journal of Liberal Thought, whose existence I previously didn't know anything about, asked me to write about the role of the Federal Government in urban affairs. I imagine they thought I would advocate the kind of ministry which they have now created for Mr. Andras, but what I said was the most important role of the Federal Government is to change the tax structure in the way that the municipalities would have adequate revenues and without that not much can be done.

And this is also the reason why the city of Stockholm can do things - they can levy income tax and therefore they can acquire land. And if I might say so, Mr. Barnicke, it was a Conservative government and under the instigation of one of the leading bankers of Sweden, Mr. Valenburg, who initiated a policy of public land ownership in Stockholm. It wasn't a socialist government. Socialists now have the benefit of this.

VIC CHANASYK:

I want to make one more remark. I don't wish to deprecate the remarks and reaction of the panel, but apart from a few statements like Mr. Barnicke just made with respect to the problems of transition from a capitalistic to a socialistic society, I think that this discussion is degenerating into the kind of discussion that we have been having for the last fifty years and that is a concentration on detail without really giving proper attention to the rationale, to the framework under which planning and development can operate on the national, provincial and regional level. And I would very much like to see this discussion start out in that vein and then get down to the kinds of specific things that the panel has been discussing.

CHAIRMAN:

We are running a little late and I am going to ask for just a couple of concluding remarks. Don Middleton I believe has something to say. June, I think we should give you at least the privilege of having the last word, if you wish to, after Don.

DON MIDDLETON:

Just a comment, and I agree with Victor's last proposal with respect to the panel, but I would drag him back to the political reality that it is exactly those little mundane things, the kind of built-in prejudices, that I tried to reflect from rural communities that stand smash in the way of making the political moves that let us look at the grand scheme. And in being critical of Len about introducing the involvement situation in the grand scheme, it is really that issue that I am trying to get at. If you can't get the grand scheme across to more than the politicians, you have failed. It has got to be through a program of getting at the citizens. Somebody said, I believe it was you in your speech, where we provide the vehicles, the opportunities for people to do this, then we can make the moves. But we can have 15,000 of these meetings in all of which we come to the grand scheme, but each of us is absolutely powerless when we walk out of here to do anything about it because our bosses in general are filled with the kind of prejudices that I tried to evince in my few comments. I think we have to be prepared to look at the task of getting the grand scheme across at a much different level than we have ever tried to do it so far.

**** TOPICS FOR THE EIGHT DISCUSSION GROUPS**

1. Do we need new cities?
2. What is the role of the official plan?
3. Is our present planning legislation adequate?
4. As in the United States, should our cities have a formal relationship with the federal government?
5. Are current regional development policies realistic?
6. Can we improve the lot of the poor in an expanding urban society?
7. Can we maintain a balance between a healthy city and healthy countryside?
8. With our knowledge and technology can government achieve a better human environment?
9. Are we tackling urban problems (housing, urban renewal, transportation, etc.) too piecemeal? Can we achieve a more comprehensive approach?
10. Transportation: Have we confused our priorities?

JUNE ROWLANDS:

I agree with the last few comments, and as someone who has watched the political process over a period of years I find this concept of a long-term plan a little scary.

I wonder how we are going to build into these concepts the participation of people and how the planning on this very long-term basis will remain relevant - will remain flexible enough to be able to reflect the kind of change, and how this input is going to be facilitated: the input from the people and - you know - this thing that we are calling citizen participation.

CHAIRMAN:

Ladies and gentlemen, I hate to cut off what I think could have gone on for a very long time and been a very stimulating and fruitful discussion throughout, but I think that there should be ample opportunity for everyone else in the room to talk about these things among themselves, and so, very reluctantly, I must extend on your behalf to all the members on the panel our common thanks for a very interesting and provocative discussion. I very much hope that they are all going to be able to stay and participate in what happens from now on.

At this point you are going to be divided up into groups. Each group will have a discussion leader and also a set of suggested topics. Now this isn't a school classroom. You are not in any sense going to be bound by the list of topics that are given to you; it is just an attempt to furnish you with some suggestions which you might wish to chew over. If you want to throw the list out entirely, you are perfectly free to do so. The discussion period will last until 5:30 p.m. and I am sure it will be very effectively terminated by the opening of the bar. I would ask you all to reconvene promptly at seven o'clock after drinking and eating, in that order, in this room.

PART 2 **"Topics for the Eight Discussion Groups"

CHAIRMAN:

Now this final part of the proceedings is going to be very informal. We have tried to keep the whole operation pretty informal, but really this is your part of the show. This is where we want to get your reaction, your responses - we are not really looking for questions. If you want to ask questions of somebody or other, by all means do so. But basically this is the opportunity for you to talk, to comment and react. The only request I would make of you is that if you do have something to say, would you mind using the mikes. The reason is not so much for people to hear you, because you can probably yell loud enough to make yourself heard, but we are taping this. So when you have something to say,

would you mind taking yourself to the mike and identifying yourself, because it is often very hard when you are trying to figure out who said what to do so just from their voice on the tape recorder. (Amen) That I think is it as far as introduction is concerned. I suppose to get the ball rolling it might be useful if I might run through the list of discussion groups and simply ask if any representatives, whether the discussion leader or someone else, would care to make any observations which he feels perhaps summarizes the sense of what that group talked about and any conclusions that they might have reached. If you don't feel like doing so, or if you don't feel there is anything really to summarize or is fit for publication, there is no obligation. But would anyone from the first discussion group feel like commenting on what they have talked about in that group? Well, let's come back to them. Group No. 2. Paul Bruer, don't forget to tell us who you are.

PAUL BRUER: Well, the second group spent most of its time on the first two questions on the paper that was provided - "Do we need new cities" and "what is the role of the official plan". We talked about some of the impressions that I have gained and in some of the interviews I have been conducting in recent months about official plans noting some of the limitations that have been in the way we have prepared and used official plans. A number of people, including myself, felt that the legislation is rather broad and yet the typical official plans are rather narrow - land-use pattern oriented sort of thing. There was quite a lengthy discussion initially about the concept of new cities. Len Gertler had quite a bit to say about some of his views regarding the Toronto Centred Region. We talked a great deal about the problem of land costs and how this underlay a good many of the problems, and I think Len was asked whether there was any evidence of any places where there was not complete nationalisation of land; whether there has been any adequate and efficient sort of planning operations that weren't completely hamstrung by this question of private ownerships of land; and the land value problem that faces municipal governments.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Paul. Anyone from Group 3?

JOHN BOWER

Nigel, since you were sitting in on part of that you will probably call me a liar so whatever I say now...

NIGEL RICHARDSON:

I thought for a horrible moment you were going to ask me to do the report and I am damned if I will.

JOHN BOWER:

Well, I failed completely, Mr. Chairman. They took off in all directions. Joe made great contributions from time to time. I think it is rather interesting that two of the papers came back marked up and I think their conclusion was that the two questions that were most important were: "Are current regional development policies realistic?" and "Are we tackling urban problems, etc. in too piecemeal a fashion? Can we achieve a more comprehensive approach?"

The question of new cities, they dealt with at length. Now I will give my own summary now, not what the group necessarily said. We subscribe to the fact that one should be thinking about new cities whether they be between Toronto and Montreal, whether they be resource towns, whether they be new dormitory towns around Metro. Toronto, or whether they be satellite towns with a high component of employment. We subscribe to this completely, but we think that these, in terms of being new cities are going to be handling the problem in ten to fifteen years time. We think that much more effort should be given to the structuring of the committed urban areas and less attention to the new city aspect, and that the structure in terms of the metro area, the Toronto-centred region I should say, in terms of providing a firm public transportation system is probably the greatest priority before thinking in terms of a new city in the Oakville area.... That is personal prejudice. The theoretical solutions to taking the pressures away from the metro urban areas are fine but they are occupying too much of our attention. They can only be expected to help solve the problem or alleviate the problem in ten to fifteen years time. There are many immediate problems in terms of realistic regional goals at a provincial level and co-ordination of federal action was brought up quite strongly by the group in terms of the federal government determining the immigration policies or accepting the responsibility for the problems that they bring on the greater urban areas. The lack of co-ordination of the various federal agencies who have a responsibility for a particular operation in a metropolitan area do not therefore contribute to the greater benefit of that area.

I think in that respect they separately face the question first of all: "Are regional development policies realistic?" I personally suspect that they are dealing with a classic hope, that many of these academic solutions will produce results in the near future and the immediate growth problems are perhaps not being alleviated to the extent that they can, while we are left with very restricted goals for this region and very restricted urban development policies. I think

probably I have said enough on my own account. That is what I say, I failed completely as a chairman, because I talk too much. Any member of the group care to put a fairer picture forward?

CHAIRMAN NIGEL:

May I say as a member of that group I am enormously impressed by the way you managed to give right off the top of the head as lucid an account of a rather rambling discussion. I don't know how you did it. I don't know if that is what we said but it is a damn good account anyway.

BILL MacADAMS (Group 4)

We addressed ourselves to question no. 1 which I think had to do with new cities. Three of my six-man group said yes, and three said no. We then picked up the theme of the last panelist, the young lady who seemed to voice concern about "how do we get people with immediate problems interested in long-term grand designs?" And we felt this was a fundamental issue that hadn't really been looked into. It seemed to us that the panel was pre-occupied with grand designs and long term solutions; reference was made to the land acquisition program, the land reform program that Len outlined over a twenty-year period, and the consensus seemed to be that our politicians at all levels, and particularly at the local government level, were elected for very short terms and their concern was this year and next year and perhaps even those with a three-year term were thinking of three years; but his was, perhaps, as far ahead as they were thinking. We then realized that we were talking about an enormous environmental, social, economic issue. We couldn't kid ourselves that new cities or urban renewal or federal housing policies or any one thing was the answer to this very complex issue. The only thing we seemed to get agreement on was that there was a fair amount of education necessary which some of us remember being talked about for twenty years, as have quite a few other things. We were very pleased when somebody came streaming into the room and said, "The bar is open". I am sorry, that is the summary that we have.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Bill. Group 5, any volunteers? conscriptees, if that is the right word? Okay, what about Group 6. Oh! - from Group 5 - what is your name please?

KENNETH CAMERON (Group 5)

I wasn't involved in all the discussions. It seemed to me that one thing that our group was concerned with that hasn't really been brought up here is the appropriate divisions of responsibility for the things that Mr. Chanasyk and Mr. Gertler were asking to be done in Canada. Again, this is a personal viewpoint, but I think there is a great tendency to expect that the federal government should be very intimately involved in this sort of thing, and one of the issues that our discussion turned around was whether or not one shouldn't compare what is being done in the Netherlands with what is being done in Ontario, rather than what is being done in Canada. So there is this question of where the real responsibility lies to be taken for this kind of development we have been discussing. It doesn't deny a national role in urban development; but in terms of the direct action that has been urged on government this afternoon, there was this discussion of whether it really shouldn't be concerned with the provincial government, particularly in Ontario.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. What about Group 6?

JOYCE TYRRELL:

Mine was a typically Canadian group because we reached consensus about nothing and I am sure that anything I say here will be violently disputed by all the other people of my group. But as far as I can, this is what I think we accomplished. We began with question seven, "how can we improve the lot of the poor in an expanding urban society?" But we very soon found that none of us were in a position to define 'poor' so we quickly got off that and we concentrated more on the current regional development policies. Are they realistic? And finally, we zoomed in on question 9, which is, "Are we tackling urban problems too piecemeal and can we achieve a more comprehensive approach?" We found that responsibility for legislative planning must be more clearly defined. At the present moment there are too many departments that have a finger in the pie, but there is a lack of common policies and objectives. The present regional plans of Ontario was cited in this. It was suggested that they are only land use plans and therefore, in fact, non-plans and will remain so until they include far more of the social and economic measures that would make up an integrated whole. As first steps in the integration it was felt that there was a great need to link fiscal measures to planning measures, for example to find a way to freeze land that is a politically acceptable method of taxation. Then more effort is needed to identify peoples' values in all their increasing complexity and diversity. It was pointed out that our values are changing extremely quickly and we need a much more sensitive

way of registering this. Whether it is through our elected representatives, we didn't go into, but in some way. And quite a little bit of our talk was in connection with what is going on in the universities and with the younger generation and to what extent their values, with regard to the almighty dollar and such things, in actuality differ from what we have known.

Also, matters which are increasingly of common concern such as control of the environment, ecology and pollution must be seen as taking precedence over the old laws of supply and demand. And finally, there was the question of the use of space and we discussed this largely in connection with the green belts and areas of no further development and this we felt has become of increasing importance, though it was pointed out that Canadians still are very far from consensus about this feeling. Within our group were people from northern Ontario who had grown up with oceans of space and valued the activity of the city, whereas we had those who had come from the more highly populated countries of Europe who felt the value of our space, and that we really as a people hadn't found our values in that. We need to know about how to use the space as a positive asset, and not just as a negative void, the thing that is between buildings or between cities.

Secondly, how to incorporate a choice of use of space that includes diversity and a sense of the joint responsibility for it. And about that time, the glasses started to clink and that was the end of my session. I am sure some of the others had different opinions.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much. I have always found that the great advantage and indeed the only advantage of being a rapporteur, from personal experience, is that you can express your own views as being those of the group. It's fair game, I think. What about group 7?

EVA SAMERY: Group 7.

I didn't expect to be asked to report. I was surprised I should and I don't think I could report in full. But I would like to mention one point which was probably quite provocative that was discussed in our group. Some other members of the group may have found some other points that they might mention, and I hope they will.

We had discussed the Toronto-Centred Region concept and one suggestion was that there weren't any alternatives put forward. We have had this often enough, but then we concluded maybe this concept was a second phase following the M.T.A.R.T. footnote study which did offer alternatives. But were they

really alternatives in a sense, as green space and urban development can be considered as two sides of the same coin.

In other words M.T.A.R.T.S. did put forward four alternatives for four different urban structures, but in the same sense they didn't put forward any alternatives for different structures of the natural environment. It was kind of a secondary consideration and the natural environment was expected to provide all the amenities as the other structure desired. So Maybe this is one thought you would like to pick up and follow up and if one would prepare alternative plans, attacking the problem from both sides and offer alternatives in both senses. That is all I have to say, but maybe some of the other members would like to contribute.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Eva. Now finally group 8. Well, perhaps not finally because I am going to come back to group 1 and see if anyone has plucked up his courage but in the meantime - group 8. Anyone willing to stick his neck out there?

ERIC SHACKELTON:

Group 8. Again, I am fortunate that the group leader took the notes away. I have the questions. We spent most of the time discussing new cities and I think that the general consensus was that the last thing we want is a new city, and probably what we do need is the boosting up of the existing complexes in the province to make them attractive enough so that everyone isn't flooding into the large Toronto complex.

"What is the role of the official plan?" Really the problem there was the lack of official plans, the places where so-called draft official plans are kept, etc. We felt that there was a role for the provincial plan and that it should be reviewed much more frequently than it is. It was suggested that it should be reviewed yearly rather than, I believe, five-yearly periods at the present moment.

"Is our present planning legislation adequate?" The group's general consensus was that it hadn't been used to the full, the present legislation hadn't been completely used. However, it was felt that it wasn't adequate even though it hadn't been used and could be augmented.

There was rather a strong feeling with regard to the federal involvement and a stress on the local involvement rather than on federal involvement - there was discussion with regard to sticks and carrots as far as federal money is concerned. And again, I think the consensus was that the federal government's encouragement should be financial in the way of tax-sharing, giving as much responsibility and as much interest in the direct governmental area as possible.

"Are current regional development policies realistic?" There was a little bit of discussion as to whether or not there was a policy. However, if regional development proposals are substituted for policy then we felt that generally speaking they were realistic. And if they can be made policy, they would help.

"Can we maintain a balance between a healthy city and a healthy countryside?" Again, the question of what this question meant. If it means the erosion of the countryside by the spreading of the city this can be done. And then we got into the recreational aspects of the healthy countryside. And the interesting part is, as more people are feeling the pressures of the city, the more use the countryside is and therefore the more money that has been invested in the countryside on other things than agriculture. In a sense we were seeing a renaissance of the countryside.

"Can we improve the lot of the poor in an expanding urban society?" The lot of the poor, we felt, had been improved. They were better off than they ever were financially. It was just that other people were that little bit more better off. We then got into the discussion whether you meant poor financially or poor in spirit and we felt that the poor in spirit aspect should be more important than poor in money.

"With our knowledge and technology can government achieve a better human environment?" We all hope so. "Are we tackling urban problems too piecemeal?" "Can we achieve a more comprehensive approach?" We all hope so. "Transportation - have we confused our priorities?" I am afraid that we never quite reached that question, and that was the end of the discussion.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Is anyone from Group 1 prepared to say something about it?

CONROY DOWSON: Group 1

On the first question there were four different opinions and the first one was "what was wrong with our old cities?" and also that Canadian cities are really not large enough to worry about limiting their growth.

Then we looked at the British example and the new towns in Britain. They started out with a goal of about 30,000 people and now they are realizing that these aren't large enough and they have raised their sights more to the quarter million. There was one opinion: double Toronto and you double the pollution. We do need new cities and pointed out as an example that New York really led to the disintegration of civilisation.

Their last opinion on question one, was that we probably do need new cities to accommodate the growth that we anticipate in the next few decades with the corollary that perhaps these new cities are not subregional, but rather they are reinforcements of regional centres.

On question 2, which was the role of the official plan, there was not too much controversy there. We believed that it was a necessary evil in a sense of the program policy of government, a co-ordinating instrument that would set out guidelines and they closed that question with the query "what is the alternative?"

On number 3, "Is our present planning legislation adequate?" We felt that there is a need for legislation requiring the integration of all the government agencies in the planning process. Would that it were that easy. Also in number 3, they felt there was a role for legislation here to provide a more favourable tax position for donation of land or access to land.

Now I jump a little bit now to number 6. "Can we maintain a balance between a healthy city and a healthy countryside?" We felt that there was an opportunity here to develop mechanisms which would allow the public access to private land. Perhaps this could be done through interim Tax concessions rather than outright ownership.

On number 5, "Are current regional development policies unrealistic?" The answer we had is: "What regional development policies?"

Number 11, transportation, "Have we confused our priorities?" There was a feeling that, thankfully, the transportation planners are probably in their proper perspective today. There was a feeling that they had in the past a little too much to say about the nature of our urbanization and that this has now switched around somewhat.

Number 8 was "With our knowledge and technology can government achieve a better human environment?" The question here-- we really need to re-evaluate our priorities and the feeling here was that the country is more than amply wealthy, certainly in terms of the world situation, and it was simply a matter of priorities and we had the technology and would go ahead and do what we liked. Some of the queries were "a 707 for Pierre Elliot, the Avro Arrow, the Bonaventure, or clean cities".

On number 7, we all heartily agreed with Hans that the lot of the poor -- I don't know whether this is the right place for it -- but we really must have a housing policy that is espoused by the three levels of government, some kind of clear-cut policy that is readily identifiable.

And then a rather tricky one, "As in the United States should our cities have a formal relationship with the federal government?" There was a fair amount of discussion on that and the general feeling was yes, they should have a formal relationship, but this relationship would be dependent on some kind of delegation of provincial powers to the city level if it were to be meaningful at all.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much Conroy. The point hat has struck me in listening to these eight accounts, personal or otherwise, of what has gone on is the range of subjects which has been covered, which I think, personally, is excellent. I would have been very disappointed if everybody had zeroed in on one or two topics. I think we have collectively covered a great deal of ground. I just jotted down, as various people were talking, a rather random selection of points which would seem to me to give us plenty of scope for discussion. We could probably be here all night, which we are not going to be, I assure you.

The question of where the responsibilities lie in the whole field of urban development and presumably the management of the environment. The question whether we are really getting a bit too hung up on this notion of new towns or new cities or new boroughs or whatever they may be called, to the neglect of what we are to do about the cities we already have and the towns we already have. There seemed to be a certain note of scepticism about regional development policy. Do we have it? If we do have it, does it really pay enough attention to economic and social consideration? The question whether our values, the values of our society are changing and the ways in which this may presumably affect urban development and planning policies. The question of how we should or could make constructive use of all the space we have at our disposal in this country. And the need for a real comprehensive, presumably three-level, government housing policy. Now those are just a very skimpy and random selection of the points that have been raised in the last few minutes. I think it gives us plenty to chew on. Ladies and gentlemen, the floor is yours. Please feel free to get up and say anything that comes into your mind as so long as it is in some general sense relevant to which we have been talking about over the last few hours.

Does anyone have anything on their minds which they are bursting to get off? I don't know this fellow. He will have to introduce himself.

JOHN PEARSON:

Well some call me John Pearson, they think I look like that guy.

"Group 9" met in the basement; it was chaired by the man who runs the government cafeterias and provides luncheons and certain holy waters. He was particularly curious about this exercise and queried whether we could act collectively. His comments reminded me of a statement contained in the Conference address given at the Annual Meeting of the Town Planning Institute of Canada some years ago. The speaker, Paul Ylvisaker, then of the Ford Foundation, congratulated the members for their support of the critical and courageous changes made in the Institute's constitution. In doing so, he warned them of the pitfalls of the caste structure and priesthoods of professions. In the last year or two I have talked with specialists in various disciplines who are breaking away from their backgrounds, their education and career experiences. Some of them are discouraged; some of them have innovative ideas but they are arbitrarily repulsed or made to feel insecure by proposing them. One of the things I get out of this exchange is that there are some inhibitions in this room because of the cross section represented among us. We need another occasion to convene, as individuals, representing a spectrum of interests that minimize the gray areas revealed in our group discussions and plenary sessions.

Another concern has to do with the research of a social scientist, Kurt Lewin, whose studies at the University of Iowa in the 1930's established the basis of what is now labelled 'group dynamics'. In 1939, I heard him lecture, once. The essence of his message was that sooner or later we have to measure relationships between individuals, between ourselves, our motives, our ambitions, our inhibitions and so forth. Instinctively, we are searching each other for clues. If we meet again we could become more closely allied to cope with the urban questions put to us today. Reflect upon how we are reacting to each other and why we gravitated to someone and don't necessarily want to see another.

I have heard people say we do have a good system of government in Canada. This generalization does not tell the whole story. The system may look good and parts of it work, but one of the chronic problems is the gap between federal-provincial levels. The provincial and municipal levels lack sufficient fusion. In many situations the relationships between the federal and the municipal levels are becoming the most critical. This structure must be mended. There are priesthoods at all levels

and it is a long way to Ottawa and vice-versa, particularly with Kurt Lewin's yard stick. We have gone some distance but there's still a long way to go.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you John. Some pertinent remarks and I'm only sorry that you didn't hold off and bring them out just at the end as a sort of summary. I think they would have been very appropriate as closing remarks for the session.

STEVEN RODD: (University of Guelph)

It seems the rural boondocks are well represented here today. I happen to be an economist. I guess maybe I am another one of these priests who is breaking out of the shackles. This point that John Pearson just made I think is particularly relevant and I think it connects with what Len and Vic were trying to tell us, where we are failing. I think Vic identified a complete failure in the area of large-scale land use, land thinking. I think Len pointed out that we are failing to hook together our systems of cities and to recognize the degree to which we can, perhaps, use that system to achieve more ends than we are now.

I might add this other link. It doesn't exist. We think it does and I think it is where, for instance, society in the United States is suffering its greatest trauma and we may too. It is the link between people and government. And as a group of planners and architects and people concerned with environment, especially on the large scale that we are talking about, of regional environment, we have utterly failed to, in any way, ask people, find out from people what matters to them in our larger scale environment of urban systems in new cities in the Toronto-Centered Region plan.

There are a lot of assumptions made, for instance in the TCR concept which has absolutely no demonstration. They may be extremely wise and accurate intuitive hunches, but we have no mechanism in our society for finding out what people care about in environment; and with increasing incomes, this is obviously a cliché, in the affluent society we care about different things than we used to. And we care about different things, primarily that we do not buy and sell as consumers in the marketplace, priced goods and services. We buy public goods and services to an increasingly large degree.

The rural landscape that Vic was telling us about and the Margin between different types of community and settlement patterns and the urban and rural systems of nature, these are

the things we are buying. This is where we are providing our outdoor recreation. This is where we are providing our rest and variety from the urbanity. We are now, as individuals, able to move from the urban centre to the countryside and we want to at least some of us assume that we want to. But we must do something better than the four year ballot box routine. It was always a very insensitive instrument to meeting issues and settling what in fact a country wanted. We need a new mechanism of government which brings together the people and registers these views, these values, and not only says what you like but what are you willing to give up of one kind of benefit from the environment or your marketplace in return for so much of another kind of benefit that you might get from those same natural and human resources.

Now maybe I have overemphasized or exaggerated this but I think it is a fundamental weakness in government and we can fool ourselves not much longer that 19th century mechanisms of government really meet the needs. I think we are really discovering this in our local government in Ontario. The regional government may only compound it.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much Professor Rodd. I Think you have raised a very pertinent and absolutely fundamental issue which I must say, I think probably we have rather glossed over today. There has been very little discussion, in spite of the fact that it is such a fashionable topic these days, about the role of the citizen, about public participation in the planning process, and I think that one of the problems, one of the most urgent and difficult problems, that we are going to have to get to grips with is how we reconcile this with the, if you like technocratic needs of an extremely complex and increasingly complex society and how it is to be planned for. I would like to thank you for raising that point which I think you did extremely ably and I would love to hear some other people comment on it. That doesn't mean that you can't comment on anything else. Is everybody stupefied by talk, food and drink, by this time?

KAMEL SAYECH (Len is my captain):

Well I was impressed really with the concept and with the discussion, so great and so nice. Yet, I have two remarks: One about the new city or new town. I think a few years ago most of our towns, our cities were new; yet we can watch and see at what stage they are. I don't see that physical obsolescence is the only factor behind this. In fact, the social obsolescence or the social decay, the economic decay are important in this issue. I don't see the new towns as a solution to our problems in terms of poverty. It will not

raise the standard of living of the poor. And once we live with that concept, the poverty concept, we will continue in the same dilemma. I think this might or should be the fifth priority. If a new town will solve this or help solve that issue this might be great.

The second remark really is one step ahead: The procedure and how to go from here really. I remember Len saying who, where, when and for what. Now who will answer these questions: is it the provincial government or the federal government or the private sector? I don't see new towns without competent peers behind it or backing it. Now the problem is: Can the federal government or can the provincial government give us an example by decentralization of the functions they have, for the time being or for a permanent time, to start new towns, to move some of these departments they have as a nucleate for that town? Or if the private sector would do that, I don't see how we could share that with them - subsidizing or industrial parts or something of this nature. But we are doing the subsidy really on the surface and I think if this can be moved to the land issue as its starting point I think the procedure would be healthier.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Very pertinent points I think. Would anyone like to reply or comment? Eric.

ERIC GROVE:

Eric Grove, and that is my boss up front. It seems to me that there is a common theme underlying the points of the last four speakers, including yourself: The ability of our technological society, the regional government program, perhaps the change of a federal society that we have, and so on, and that is that the thought occurs to me that nothing will get done unless people want it. And I would have thought the first task is to get through to, and pardon me, I will be quite blunt, a somewhat obtuse public group of people in Canada, the thoughts that we are expressing in this room.

CHAIRMAN:

I hope you don't say that when you are giving talks down in Haldimand and Norfolk,

ERIC GROVE:

Let me say I put it a little more delicately. But this seems to me to be the first point, you know, since we have been batting our heads for the last eighteen months along with many other people trying to get this information

through and it hasn't got through. Until we get the public wanting these things and seeing them with the same perception as we see them, nothing will be done.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Eric. That raises a point in my mind. I hadn't intended to make any comments on my own but I am going to use the chairman's prerogative for once. We have talked about communications with the public and in turn getting the public to communicate with us; and we have talked about lack of co-ordination among governments and lack of co-ordination among government programs; lack of any consistent overall policies relating to urban growth, but what we haven't talked about, or at least in none of the sessions which I have listened to, although John Pearson a moment ago touched on this, is communications among ourselves as professionals of one kind or another. Do planners and architects and developers and civil servants and politicians and all the rest of us, and there are dozens of groups I suppose who are involved in one way or another in urban development, do we talk to each other enough? Do we understand what the other fellow is trying to say, or are we interested?

ERIC HARDY:

I just wanted to put in a comment out of ignorance because I wasn't here for the afternoon and you probably dealt with it thoroughly. The impression I got however, from the tail end of the discussion group, the chat over the buffet meal and the reporting from the group sessions, is that you have been looking at bits and pieces of the situation. Perhaps there is some need to consider the overall relationships here and whether there is a failure to satisfy the overall relationships that need to prevail among regional development policies, regional government policies and getting down into the details of urban growth and the direction, control of urban growth, the place of new towns, and so on.

I have the feeling that this is where government is falling down most seriously. The Province of Ontario has in its policy statements endeavoured to relate these areas and if one looks and accepts with a kind of literal acceptance and non-critical view, the Design for Development statements that were put into the Legislature at two stages of the Ontario government's recent history, you say, "Oh, yes they looked at regional development. They have looked at regional government. They have seen the relationship and they have tried to put this whole jigsaw together." It is more plausible in the sense that they have dealt with the whole field than in the results that have been obtained.

In my opinion there has been a great deal of stumbling insofar as regional development studies have been concerned. This area was opened up, certainly, what - twenty-five years ago? - and yet we haven't got a full complement of regional development studies for the ten broad regions of the province yet. So we are moving very slowly in this area if we attach the importance that is supposed to be attached to this field, - there is some very bad fumbling. I have sympathy for Professor Rodd who made a comment. On regional government we have gone at this with various thrusts. People will have to recognize my biases on this and I suggest to you one fundamental, one crucial error in policy, and I think there are other errors as well, but I think they are minor by comparison. One crucial area in policy means that on regional government we are digging ourselves into a steadily worsening departure from good government forms. It becomes more and more ludicrous to suggest that we are now undergoing a second revolution of governmental structure where the Baldwin Act was the first. But both Mr. Robarts and Mr. McKeogh said this in the Legislature a matter of three years ago, or something of this sort. I think this is increasingly ludicrous. We are losing, we are losing a structural simplicity and reliance upon the country in the governmental structure, but we are not replacing it with a satisfactory regional scheme. In fact, by believing we can advance piecemeal into regional government we are digging ourselves steadily further and further into positions which it is difficult to retreat, but which damage areas of progress that we ought to be getting into. This to me is central to the whole topic and it does come back to this question: Is the governmental machinery incapable of harnessing both professional skills and public opinion and bringing them together to achieve some relatively simple kinds of progress?

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Eric. I suppose I have to be a little bit cautious in commenting on what you said, but I would like to thank you for saying it. You too, brought up an aspect of the topic that we have been discussing for the last few hours which probably has not been given the attention which it deserves.

IRVING GROSSMAN:

Just a point. There was a comment made about public participation and this is seen in the newspapers all the time and is constantly being referred to and the whole question of how to have this happen is discussed - and then the question of what information does the public have and what grounds do they have, separate from the issues of

essential poverty issues which are ones of more clearly identifiable areas. But when we talk about the larger issues of what our cities should look like and so on, there is a great deal of vagueness. I am just struck on a thought here, as one of the previous speakers was going on, on the question of pollution. Really, the outcry and the shouting that becomes so evident lately has been brought on by the mass media, I would venture to say. The numerous television shows and newspaper articles and the repetition and the hammering of these issues to the foreground have made everyone excited. And now it is called an issue. But it was made into an issue, I think, by the mass media, a very powerful influence. It is a self-evident truth. I was just wondering -- I remember asking Hans Blumenfeld years ago how come Amsterdam and Rotterdam, for example, are such beautiful cities and they are downtown? They were built in a time when free enterprise was going rampant and the merchants were -- (it was an independent business state, it wasn't socialism which some people were concerned about) and the answer was because the people wanted it that way. It was an aristocracy and they wanted their city to be beautiful. I am just wondering in our days where things are more complicated, whether we are missing the boat on a very prime level and that is one of mass information and that this whole question of concern for the environment and all the various complexities is one of really having a very highly-organized public information function which really uses the media continuously in an educational capacity where the public who are looking for information, where the developers I know are looking for information, where the politicians are looking for information. You hear them discussing it amongst themselves. They really don't know the implications of the transportation and you have public debate, public forums on a very large important significant scale with top people involved in the presentation of this material, in researching it, and it becomes a terribly major element in the media. And I think you would probably find more involvement, more issues, and eventually it percolates into a political level and eventually things are done properly. I am just thinking that this is a terribly key area which maybe is part of this whole debate we have been discussing and hasn't really been raised as one of seriousness.

Last night I attended city hall at one meeting, and across the way there was another one by the Citizens Forum, one that anyone could come in on. I finished one meeting and went across and listened to their discussion which was about the waterfront for Toronto. People were actually proposing that the planning staff, of whom there was a representation, should present to the public numerous alternatives for what the waterfront could be, and let the citizens decide. A very interesting idea. How would

they decide? Well, why not print in the newspapers, which have hundreds of thousands of distribution, the plans with a coding, commercial, greenbelt, parks, entertainment, industry and so on and let the public colour in the bloody maps and send them in by the thousands to the politicians and then they can choose by plebiscite what is the best use for the waterfront. It sounded far-fetched at first, but it is as interesting an idea as I have heard lately.

JOE BARNICKE:

Mr. Chairman, can I have one second. To Len, I think there was a misunderstanding. I did not mean whole-sale planning, dollar planning as sometimes the term is used in the United States. On the items here, I personally go along with the official plans, but I do say this: the official plans should be a guide and not a gospel and I think that is where it rubs development the wrong way. They use Toronto as a base at the Municipal Board, they use a tight control competitive area on the same ground rules as a loosely controlled area which is dying for industry, dying for commercial growth. As to the question - "Do we need new cities?" the only comment I have to make and we do a fair amount of dealing in retail work across Canada, I don't think we need any more new cities. I think we should start fighting for our old ones. The problem is with the planners, they are so involved with subdivisions, residential developments outside the periphery core that not enough attention is paid to the core.

I can state this from experience. - We are the fellows that have to rent the project and we know whether we are going uphill with the wind in our face, or we are paddling down stream. Cities like Sarnia, Brantford, St. Catharines, Chatham, Windsor -- the downtown areas are deteriorating. Sarnia is probably one of the worst hit in Ontario. In Hamilton there is probably a larger buffer area of questionable growth than there is in Toronto but Hamilton is doing something about it. Now, fortunately, Toronto is beginning to rebuild the core, but there is a big buffer around that core that is going to consist of old buildings and warehouses before it is recreated into some higher density use. The only comment I emphasized regarding the question "Do we need new cities?" is I don't think the planning community truly appreciates how sad the downtowns are becoming in our cities across Canada while shopping centres locate in the periphery.

Cities like Guelph, I think, are doing well. It's downtown has been saved. Stratford I think will be strong. Peterborough is still strong enough. Belleville is revitalizing itself as well as Kingston. But in other urban centres, the people, the planners and the politicians aren't with it the destiny of the downtowns. That is where I think we should be spending our time to save some of these community centres rather than building in new areas and creating new problems.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Joe. We are going to wind up with that. I am not going to make any attempt to summarize. I don't think it is possible to summarize what we have heard this afternoon and what we have talked about this afternoon in less than a couple of hours, and if you were willing to put up with that, I am certainly not willing to attempt it.

I am going to close by a couple of very mundane remarks. In the first place to remind you, if you haven't paid for your food to do so before you get out of here. Secondly, if you have any remarks, comments or suggestions, please scribble them out and drop them in the box here. We have had, I think, a tremendous number of stimulating and useful ideas offered to us in the last few hours. We may have started something, I don't know. If we have, I don't know how it will be continued, but I hope that at least, if nothing else is done in a formal sense, you will go away having acquired a certain amount of food for thought and a few ideas to chew over that perhaps hadn't occurred to you before. If we have accomplished that I think we have accomplished a great deal.

Again on your behalf, I would like to thank most sincerely the two main speakers and the four panelists, and on my own behalf I would like to thank you people in particular, those of you who are still in this room for your hardihood in sticking it out to the end.

Thank you all and goodnight.

CONSULTANTS:

W. HUZAR
M. H. Kilpatrick & Associates
6 Lansing Square
Toronto

J. J. BARNICKE
J. J. Barnicke LTD.
100 Adelaide West
Toronto

Patrick FRANGELLA
Susan LARNER
Erickson Massey Architects & Planners
69 Berkeley Square
Toronto

Conroy G. DOWSON
Director of Planning
R. V. Anderson Associates Limited
194 Wilson Avenue
Toronto

Max BACON
Procter Redfern Bonsfield & Bacon
75 Eglinton Avenue East
Toronto

David S. SCARTH
Leslie J. WILL
Habitat Planning Consultants
1111 Bay street

Simon MILES
INTERMET
Toronto Secretariat
Suite 1200
130 Bloor Street West
Toronto

Paul H. PRICE
Alan D. WARD
Philips Planning & Engineering Ltd.
3215 Queen Elizabeth Way - P.O. Box 220
Burlington

CONSULTANTS Continued:

J. E. FARR
Bosley Associates
2323 Yonge Street
Toronto

Lionel D. FELDMAN
Consultant (Municipal Affairs)
P. S. Ross & Partner
200 University Avenue
Toronto

E. G. FALUDI
E. G. Faludi Associates
505 Eglinton Avenue West
Toronto

S. H. JAMES
James F. MacLaren Ltd.
321 Bloor Street East
Toronto

V. D. MEULEN
J. ZOHAR
van Der Meulen, Zohar & Associates LTD.
207 Queen's Quay West
Toronto

Eric HARDY ; Michael WOOD
Eric Hardy Consulting Ltd.
42 Charles Street East
Toronto

Pierre Beeckmans
Municipal Planning Consultants
400 Mt. Pleasant
Toronto

R. V. DEE
Larry Smith Research Ltd.
Royal Trust Tower
Toronto

G. R. D. FRYER
Damas & Smith Ltd.
265 Yorkland
Toronto

UNIVERSITIES:

R. Stephen RODD
Department of Agricultural Economics
University of Guelph

W. Van VUUREN
Department of Agricultural Economics
University of Guelph

John F. BETAK
Department of Geography
McMaster University

R. W. McCABE
Department of URBAN & Regional Planning
University of Toronto

G. Angus HILLS
Faculty of Forestry
University of Toronto

John R. HITCHCOCK
Urban & Regional Planning
University of Toronto

Professor John Dakin
Director
Urban & Regional Planning
University of Toronto

Mr. Hugh T. Lemon
Professional Liaison Officer
School of Urban & Regional Planning
Division of Environmental Studies
University of Waterloo

Kamel SAYECH
University of Waterloo
Saul HERZOG
University of Waterloo

OTHERS:

Cedrick J. Watkiss
Dominion Life Association
Waterloo

E. H. SUICHIES
Executive Director
Intergovernmental Committee on Urban
Regional Research
Toronto.

John JORDAN
Executive Director
Ontario Habitate Foundation
51 Prince Arthur
Toronto

I. GROSSMAN
Architect
I. Grossman Associates
Toronto.

H. EMOLE
Hon. Secretary
Community Planning Association of Canada
Toronto

Mrs. Joyce TYRRELL
Project Officer
Department of Adult Education
Ontario Institute for Studies and Education
252 Bloor St. West
Toronto

CONSULTANTS continued;

Keith LATHEM
Crysler & Lathem
Consulting Engineers/Resources Management
69 Glenn Cameron Road
Thornhill, Ontario

Carl ALTENBERG
A. M. Spreit & Associates
London, Ontario

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT:

R. J. IRVINE
V. GALLANT
Outdoor Recreation Division
Department of Lands & Forests

W. G. MASLEN
Supervisor,
Land Acquisition & Planning Section
Department of Lands and Forests

J. H. CHRISTMAN
Engineering Section
Department of Lands and Forests

Dr. E. A. HASLETT
Director
Farm Economics
Co-operation & Statistics Branch
Department of Lands and Forests

D. L. MINSHALL
Superintendent
Regional Programs
Youth & Recreation Branch
Department of Education

Doug McFARLANE
Regional Transportation Planner
Administration Building
Department of Highways

A. R. SCHMIDT
Regional Planning Branch
Department of Treasury and Economics
(Central and Georgian Bay Regions)

J. Ross THORPE
Community Deveopmnt. Branch
Department of the Provincial Secretary and
Citizenship

E. G. WILSON
Regional Planner for the Southern Region
Regional office in Maple
Department of Lands and Forests

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT
Continued;

Kevin LETHBRIDGE
Engineer - Regional Services Planning Branch
O.W.R.C.

F. SHACKLETON
Assistant Chief Architect
Chief Architect's Branch
Ontario Housing Corporation

Nigel RICHARDSON
Study Director
Haldimand Norfolk Study
Department of Municipal Affairs

Mrs. E. SAMERY
similar to above

Eric GROVE
similar to above

Keith G. BAIN
Supervisor - Official Plans Section
Department of Municipal Affairs

Dan McDONALD
Eastern Ontario & Lake Ontario Region
Regional Development Branch
Department of Treasury and Economics

H. S. Grewal
Assistant Supervisor
Urban Renewal Section
Department of Municipal Affairs

Karen STEVEN
Community Planning Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs

Paul Bruer
Special Project Planner
Official Plans Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT
DEPARTMENTS - continued:

John O. PEARSON
Co-ordinator of Programs
Municipal Research Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs

Ken CAMERON
Research Officer - Research Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs

E. A. GOMME
Planning Administrator
Community Planning Branch
Department of Municipal Affairs

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY
AND ECONOMICS
DEC 9 - 1971
POLICY PLANNING
DIVISION

